

52



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,785	04/18/2001	Young Francis Day	2000P09095 US01	9919

7590 07/22/2004
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, PAUL H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,785

Applicant(s)

DAY ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Nguyen-Ba

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/18/2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 19-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/18/2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/18/2001.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This action is responsive to the Election received on June 17, 2004. Applicant elected Claims 1-14, 19-25 of Group I. Claims 15-18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to non-elected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse. Applicant's comments have been noted.
2. Claims 1-14 and 19-25 have been considered. Claims 1, 19, 22, and 24 are independent claims.
3. If a copy of a provisional application listed on the bottom portion of the accompanying Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) form is not included with this Office action and the PTO-892 has been annotated to indicate that the copy was not readily available, it is because the copy could not be readily obtained when the Office action was mailed. Should applicant desire a copy of such a provisional application, applicant should promptly request the copy from the Office of Public Records (OPR) in accordance with 37 CFR 1.14(a)(1)(iv), paying the required fee under 37 CFR 1.19(b)(1). If a copy is ordered from OPR, the shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action will not be reset under MPEP § 710.06 unless applicant can demonstrate a substantial delay by the Office in fulfilling the order for the copy of the provisional application. Where the applicant has been notified on the PTO-892 that a copy of the provisional application is not readily available, the provision of MPEP § 707.05(a) that a copy of the cited reference will be automatically furnished without charge does not apply.

Art Unit: 2176

Priority

4. This application claims benefit under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) of provisional patent application 60/259,610, filed on December 18, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4-9, 11-13, 19, 20, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zaharkin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747.

Independent Claim 1

Zaharkin teaches a system for *transforming a document from a first format to a different second format, said document being encoded in a language including presentation style determination attributes* (see pg.1 - [0002]), comprising:

a source of transformation parameters determining a desired presentation style and content structure (pg. 2 – [0026] → includes a configuration file that is received by the

Art Unit: 2176

disambiguator which specifies predetermined parameters describing how the disambiguation process operates);

an input document processor for transforming a received input document in a first format (pg. 2 – [0025] → receives document of ambiguated and/or ambiguous data) by parsing said input document and collating elements of said input document into a hierarchically ordered structure representing an intermediate document structure (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 3 – [0034], [0036], [0037]; pg. 4, [0057] → system includes a mapper that receives a document. The mapper creates a mapping file from the document); and

a transformation processor for transforming said intermediate document structure into an output document with said desired presentation style of a second format in response to said transformation parameters (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 4 – [0055] → The disambiguator receives the mapping file and the document type definition (DTD). The disambiguator converts the mapping file into an output file that complies with the DTD and/or disambiguates the mapping file in reference to, or based on, the DTD).

Claim 4

Zaharkin further teaches a system including *a filter for excluding undesired information from said output documents (pg. 3 – [0039] → a path is filtered if it is not acceptable to the DTD with tag inference in reference to, or based on, the rules of the markup language of the DTD, such as SGML).*

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 5

Zaharkin further teaches *a sorting processor...output document* (pg. 1 – [0008] → mapping file having one node representing each possible mapping of an element of the DTD to a portion of the document).

Claim 6

Zaharkin further teaches a *system wherein said input documents and said output documents are different...multimedia file* (pg. 1 - [0002]; pg. 4 – [0046] → i.e. SGML converted into XML or vice versa).

Claim 7

Zaharkin further teaches *transformation parameters identifying input document type and output documents type* (pg. 2 – [0026] → System includes a configuration file that is received by the disambiguator which specifies predetermined settings and/or parameters describing how the disambiguation process of the disambiguator operate. For example, one setting and/or parameter that specifies the markup syntax of the DTD and the output file, such as Extensible Markup Language (XML) and/or Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)).

Claim 8

Zaharkin further teaches a system wherein *said source of transformation parameters comprises an SGML document* (pg. 1 – [004]; pg. 4 – [0046]).

Claim 9

Zaharkin further teaches a system wherein *said transformation processor transforms said intermediate document structure into said output document...by performing at least one*

Art Unit: 2176

of...reordering operation...document structure (pg. 3 – [0037]; pg. 4 – [0056] → DTD **reorders** by declaring where each tag is allowed and which tags can appear within other tags).

Claim 11

Zaharkin further teaches a system wherein *said transformation parameters include transformation rules...into said output documents* (pg. 2 – [0026] → System includes a configuration file that is received by the disambiguator which specifies predetermined settings and/or parameters describing how the disambiguation process of the disambiguator operate. For example, one setting and/or parameter that specifies the markup syntax of the DTD and the output file, such as Extensible Markup Language (XML) and/or Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)).

Claim 12

Zaharkin further teaches a system wherein *said transformation rules map elements...hierarchical tree structure...output documents* (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 3 – [0034]-[0037] → elements are mapped into a hierarchical tree structure of the DTD).

Claim 13

Zaharkin further teaches a system including *a management processor for determining said transformation parameters...desired presentation style* (pg. 2 – [0026] → i.e. disambiguator).

Independent Claim 19

Adaptive processing system claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 20

Zaharkin teaches the adaptive processing system wherein *said second format for presentation on at least one display device from, (a) a mobile or non-mobile phone, (b) a personal data assistant device, (c) a PC, (d) a TV (e) another processing device* (see pg 2 – [0019]-[0024] → i.e. computer monitor).

Independent Claim 24

Method claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as independent claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 25

Zaharkin further teaches a method wherein *said converting step includes applying transformation rules mapping elements...output element* (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 4 – [0055] → The disambiguator receives the mapping file and the document type definition (DTD). The disambiguator converts the mapping file into an output file that complies with the DTD and/or disambiguates the mapping file in reference to, or based on, the DTD).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 3, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaharkin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747, in view of Sorge et al. ("Sorge"), U.S. Patent No. 6,613,098.

Claims 2 and 3

Zaharkin teaches a system for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach including a *preprocessor for resolving conflicts arising due to said transformation parameters in accordance with predetermined conflict resolution rules...in accordance with said conflict resolution rules and a preprocessor for correcting errors in at least one of, (a) said input document, and (b) said transformation parameters.*

However, Sorge teaches a processor for recognizing and resolving conflicts and errors due to transformation parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Since Zaharkin and Sorge are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Sorge would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Zaharkin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Zaharkin with the teachings of Sorge to include a preprocessor for recognizing and resolving conflicts and errors due to transformation parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an

Art Unit: 2176

output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Independent Claim 22

With respect to independent claim 22, refer to the rationale relied upon to reject claim 1. Zaharkin does not specifically teach including a *preprocessor for resolving conflicts arising due to said transformation parameters in accordance with predetermined conflict resolution rules...in accordance with said conflict resolution rules.*

However, Sorge teaches a processor for recognizing and resolving conflicts due to transformation parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Since Zaharkin and Sorge are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Sorge would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Zaharkin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Zaharkin with the teachings of Sorge to include a preprocessor for recognizing and resolving conflicts and due to transformation parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Claim 23

Zaharkin teaches a method for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim 22 as discussed above, but does not

Art Unit: 2176

specifically teach transforming said intermediate document structure (i.e. mapping file) into said output document by, *Adopting...allocating content...determined display page style*.

However, Zaharkin teaches the use of DTD document and mapping file to define the rules and format of the document in terms of a set of declarations for a markup language (pg. 2 – [0025], [0026] → i.e. DTD) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format.

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art to use style sheets (XSL, XSLT, CSS, etc.) for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a style sheet in the art of Zaharkin for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

9. Claims 10, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaharkin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747.

Claim 10

Zaharkin teaches a system for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim1 as discussed above, but does not specifically

Art Unit: 2176

teach transforming said intermediate document structure (i.e. mapping file) into said output document by, *Adopting...allocating content...determined display page style.*

However, Zaharkin teaches the use of DTD document and mapping file to define the rules and format of the document in terms of a set of declarations for a markup language (pg. 2 – [0025], [0026] → i.e. DTD) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format.

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art to use style sheets (XSL, XSLT, CSS, etc.) for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a style sheet in the art of Zaharkin for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

Claim 14

Zaharkin teaches a system for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach a system *wherein said transformation parameters include at least two of, (a) a page layout size, (b) number of characters per line, (c) number of lines per page, (d) font type and size, (e) heading allocation definition, (f) a scroll or non-scroll selection parameter, and (g) graphics layout definition.*

However, Zaharkin teaches parameters which specify markup syntax of the DTD and output file (pg. 2 – [0026]) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include transformation parameters including at least two of, (a) a page layout size, (b) number of characters per line, (c) number of lines per page, (d) font type and size, (e) heading allocation definition, (f) a scroll or non-scroll selection parameter, and (g) graphics layout definition for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Claim 21

Zaharkin teaches an adaptive processing system with respect to independent claim 19 as discussed above but does not specifically teach a system wherein said selected second format is selected from at least one of, (a) different display resolution formats and (b) a scrolling format and (c) a non-scrolling format.

However, Zaharkin teaches a computer using operating systems such as Microsoft Windows or Apple MacOS operating systems which are well-known in the art to include (a) different display resolution formats and (b) a scrolling formats and (c) a non-scrolling formats for the purpose of viewing information on a computer screen.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include at least one of, (a) different display resolution formats and (b)

Art Unit: 2176

a scrolling format and (c) a non-scrolling format for the purpose of viewing information on a computer screen.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (703) 305-8776. The examiner can normally be reached from 10:30 am - 7:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER